arXiv:1606.06942v1 [math.CO] 22 Jun 2016

QUASISYMMETRIC (k,l)-HOOK SCHUR FUNCTIONS

SARAH K. MASON AND ELIZABETH NIESE*

Abstract. We introduce a quasisymmetric generalization of Berele and Regev's hook Schur functions and prove that these new quasisymmetric hook Schur functions decompose the hook Schur functions in a natural way. We examine the combinatorics of the quasisymmetric hook Schur functions, providing a relationship to Gessel's fundamental quasisymmetric functions and an analogue of the Robinson-Schensted-Knuth algorithm. We also prove that the multiplication of quasisymmetric hook Schur functions with hook Schur functions behaves the same as the multiplication of quasisymmetric Schur functions with Schur functions.

1. Introduction

Hook Young diagrams became of interest as the classical Schur-Weyl duality was extended to the general linear Lie superalgebra. Schur [Sch01] determined a one-to-one correspondence between irreducible representations of the general linear group $GL(V)$ and subsets of the irreducible representations of S_n. Weyl's *Strip Theorem* [Wey39] states that these irreducible representations of the general linear group $GL(V)$ are precisely those obtained from partitions whose Young diagrams lie inside a strip of height k, where k is the dimension of the vector space V. Schur's action of S_n on $V^{\otimes n}$ and that from Weyl's Strip Theorem are dual. Berele and Regev [BR87] generalize the two actions of S_n on $V^{\otimes n}$ into a single action by considering a decomposable vector space $V = T \oplus U$ such that $\dim(T) = k$ and $\dim(U) = l$. In this new setting, the indexing set is given by partitions which lie inside a hook shape of height k and width l, called a *hook Young diagram*, meaning there are at most k parts greater than l. Berele and Regev use certain fillings of these diagrams to generate polynomials known as (k,l)-hook Schur functions on two sets of variables, which generalize the classical Schur functions and appear naturally when examining characters of a certain S_n representation of $GL(k) \times GL(l)$.

Remmel [Rem84] introduces an analogue of the Robinson-Schensted-Knuth (RSK) algorithm for (k,l)-*semistandard tableaux*, the objects used to generate (k,l)-hook Schur functions. The insertion algorithm underlying this RSK analogue is an important component in the rule for multiplying two (k,l)-hook Schur functions. This procedure is similar to the Schensted insertion used in the proof of the Littlewood-Richardson rule for the product of two Schur functions. Remmel [Rem87] further exploits the rich structure of these objects to prove a number of permutation statistic identities, including a generalization of the *Cauchy Identity* [Mac92] which provides a generating function for products of Schur functions.

The Schur functions (which form a basis for symmetric functions) can be obtained as specializations of Macdonald polynomials [Mac95]. A basis for quasisymmetric functions can be similarly obtained through specializations of nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials [HLMvW11]. This basis, called the *quasisymmetric Schur function basis*, can also be obtained by summing certain collections of Type A Demazure atoms and is of interest due to its combinatorial similarities to the Schur functions [LMvW13] as well as its algebraic significance in the noncommutative character theory of the symmetric group [vW13].

In this paper, we provide a quasisymmetric analogue of the (k,l)-hook Schur functions obtained by summing the weights of fillings of composition diagrams satisfying certain conditions and prove that this analogue

Key words and phrases. quasisymmetric functions, Schur functions, tableaux, RSK.

* This work was supported by the Wake Forest University Pilot Collaboration Grant.

$$T = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1' & & & \\ \hline 1' & 2' & & \\ \hline 2 & 2 & 3' & 4' \\ \hline 1 & 1 & 4 & 4' \\ \hline \end{array}$$

FIGURE 2.1. T is a semistandard hook tableau of shape $(4,4,2,1)$ and weight $x_1^2x_2^2x_4y_1^2y_2y_3y_4^2$.

decomposes the (k,l)-hook Schur functions in a natural way.[1] In Section 2, we describe the hook composition tableaux used to generate the quasisymmetric hook Schur functions which are obtained from a combination of quasisymmetric Schur functions and row-strict quasisymmetric Schur functions. In Section 3 we discuss several properties of the quasisymmetric hook Schur functions. Section 4 describes a relationship between the quasisymmetric hook Schur functions and a superized version of Gessel's fundamental quasisymmetric functions. In Sections 5 and 6 we introduce an insertion algorithm and use it to provide an analogue of the Robinson-Schensted-Knuth algorithm as well as a generalized Cauchy identity. In Section 7 we prove a Littlewood-Richardson rule for the product of a quasisymmetric hook Schur function and a hook Schur function. Sections 2, 3, 5, and 6 appeared in an extended abstract format in [MN14] but Sections 4 and 7 are new to this paper.

1.1. **Acknowledgements.** The authors would like to especially thank Jeff Remmel for suggesting this avenue of research and his helpful comments along the way. The helpful comments of an anonymous reviewer were also instrumental in completing the proof of the Littlewood-Richardson analogue.

2. Background

The (k,l)-hook Schur functions introduced by Berele and Regev [BR87] are defined combinatorially using (k,l)-semistandard hook tableaux. Frequently the k and l designations are dropped and these diagrams are referred to simply as *semistandard hook tableaux*. Begin with the *Young diagram* of $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_n)$, which is given by placing λ_i boxes (or *cells*) in the i^{th} row from the bottom of the diagram, in French notation. A (k,l)-*semistandard hook tableau* (SSHT) of shape λ is a filling of the Young diagram of λ with letters from two different alphabets $\mathcal{A} = \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ and $\mathcal{A}' = \{1', 2', \ldots, l'\}$ where $k < 1'$ such that the unprimed entries weakly increase from left to right along rows and strictly increase from bottom to top in columns while the primed entries strictly increase from left to right along rows and weakly increase from bottom to top in columns [BR87]. All rows and columns must be weakly increasing, so in any given column all of the primed entries appear in a higher row than all of the unprimed entries, and in any given row all of the primed entries appear to the right of all of the unprimed entries, as seen in Figure 2.1. We can then define a (k,l)-*hook Schur function* as a polynomial in $X = x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k$ and $Y = y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_l$ by

$$HS_\lambda(X;Y) = \sum_{T \in SSHT(\lambda)} x_1^{v_1}x_2^{v_2}\cdots x_k^{v_k}y_1^{u_1}y_2^{u_2}\cdots y_l^{u_l},$$

where v_i is the number of times i occurs in T and u_i is the number of times i' occurs in T. Note that $HS_\lambda(X;0) = s_\lambda(X)$ and $HS_\lambda(0;Y) = s_{\lambda'}(Y)$ where λ' is the conjugate partition of λ and s_λ is a Schur polynomial.

The quasisymmetric Schur functions were introduced in [HLMvW11] as polynomials generated by *composition tableaux*, generalizations of semistandard Young tableaux whose underlying shapes are compositions instead of partitions. These polynomials form a basis for quasisymmetric functions and decompose the Schur functions in a natural way. A closely related set of polynomials, still given by fillings of composition diagrams [LMvW13], is more natural for us to work with for the purposes of this paper, but note that this new

[1] An extended abstract of the first three sections and the fifth and sixth sections of this paper appeared in [MN14].

form, denoted here by $\mathcal{CS}_\alpha$, is easily obtained from the original definition by a reversal of the entries in a filling. A slight modification of the definition of $\mathcal{CS}_\alpha$ produces a new basis for quasisymmetric functions that is generated using a row-strict analogue of the composition tableaux [MR14]. We will again work with the variation, $\mathcal{RS}_\alpha$, of the row-strict quasisymmetric functions obtained by the same reversal procedure as is employed in [LMvW13]. In fact, we further extend this approach to include skew compositions as indexing compositions as in [MN15].

Let $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_m)$ be a composition. Then its *composition diagram* is given by placing α_i boxes (or *cells*) in the i^{th} row from the bottom of the diagram, in French notation. The cells are indexed by row and column, so that (i, j) refers to the cell in the i^{th} row from the bottom and the j^{th} column from the left. The composition α is said to be *contained* in the composition β (written $\alpha \subset \beta$) if and only if $\ell(\alpha) \leq \ell(\beta)$ and $\alpha_i \leq \beta_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell(\alpha)$. Given $\alpha \subset \beta$, we define a *skew composition diagram* of shape $\beta//\alpha$ to be the diagram of β with the cells of α removed from the bottom left corner.

Definition 2.1. A filling $T : \beta//\alpha \to \mathbb{Z}_+$ is a *semi-standard Young composition tableau (SSYCT)* of shape $\beta//\alpha$ if it satisfies the following conditions:

(1) the row entries are weakly increasing from left to right,
(2) the entries in the leftmost column are strictly increasing from bottom to top, and
(3) (triple condition) for $1 \leq i < j \leq \ell(\beta)$ and $1 \leq k < m$, where m is the size of the largest part of β, if $T(i, k+1) \neq \infty$ and $T(i, k+1) \geq T(j, k)$, then $T(i, k+1) > T(j, k+1)$, assuming the entry in any cell not contained in β is ∞ and the entry in any cell contained in α is 0.

Let β be a composition. Then the Young quasisymmetric Schur function $\mathcal{CS}_\beta$ is given by

$$\mathcal{CS}_\beta = \sum_T x^T$$

where the sum is over all SSYCT T of shape β, where β may be a skew composition.

Definition 2.2. A filling $T : \beta//\alpha \to \mathbb{Z}_+$ is a *semi-standard Young row-strict composition tableau (SSYRT)* of shape $\beta//\alpha$ if it satisfies the following conditions:

(1) the row entries are strictly increasing from left to right,
(2) the entries in the leftmost column are weakly increasing from bottom to top, and
(3) (triple condition) for $1 \leq i < j \leq \ell(\beta)$ and $1 \leq k < m$, where m is the size of the largest part of β, if $T(i, k+1) \neq \infty$ and $T(i, k+1) > T(j, k)$, then $T(i, k+1) \geq T(j, k+1)$, assuming the entry in any cell not contained in β is ∞ and the entry in any cell contained in α is 0.

Let β be a composition. Then the Young row-strict quasisymmetric Schur function $\mathcal{RS}_\beta$ is given by

$$\mathcal{RS}_\beta = \sum_T x^T$$

where the sum is over all SSYRT T of shape β, where β may be a skew composition.

Combining these two approaches, we have the following definition for the composition analogue of a (k, l)-semistandard hook tableau.

Definition 2.3. As before, let $\mathcal{A} = \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ and $\mathcal{A}' = \{1', 2', \ldots, l'\}$ with total ordering $1 < 2 < \cdots < k < 1' < 2' \cdots < l'$ on $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}'$. Given a composition diagram $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_r)$ with largest part m, a *hook composition tableau* (HCT), F, is a filling of the cells of α with letters from $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}'$ such that

(1) the entries of F weakly increase in each row when read from left to right,
(2) the unprimed (resp. primed) entries of F weakly (resp. strictly) increase in each row when read from left to right,
(3) the unprimed (resp. primed) entries in the leftmost column of F strictly (resp. weakly) increase when read from bottom to top,



FIGURE 2.2. Triple configuration with $\hat{F}(i,n+1)=a$, $\hat{F}(j,n)=b$, and $\hat{F}(j,n+1)=c$. If $a\in\mathcal{A}$, then $a\geq b\Rightarrow a>c$. If $a\in\mathcal{A}'$, then $a>b\Rightarrow a\geq c$.

(4) and F satisfies the following *triple rule*:
Supplement F by adding enough cells with infinity-valued entries to the end of each row so that the resulting supplemented tableau, $\hat{F}$, is of rectangular shape $r\times m$. Then for $1\leq i<j\leq r$, $2\leq n\leq m$, where $\hat{F}(i,n)$ denotes the entry of $\hat{F}$ that lies in the cell in the i-th row from the bottom and n-th column from the left,
   (a) if $\hat{F}(i,n+1)\in\mathcal{A}$ and $\hat{F}(i,n+1)\geq\hat{F}(j,n)$, then $\hat{F}(i,n+1)>\hat{F}(j,n+1)$, and
   (b) if $\hat{F}(i,n+1)\in\mathcal{A}'$ and $\hat{F}(i,n+1)>\hat{F}(j,n)$, then $\hat{F}(i,n+1)\geq\hat{F}(j,n+1)$.

See Figure 2 for the triple configuration. Note that triple rule (a) is identical to the triple rule used to define a *semi-standard Young composition tableau* in Definition 2.1 and that triple rule (b) is identical to the triple rule used to define a *row-strict semi-standard Young composition tableau* in Definition 2.2. This is due to the fact that the unprimed portion of the filling behaves like a semistandard Young composition tableau while the primed portion behaves like a row-strict analogue of a skew semistandard Young composition tableau.

Definition 2.4. The *quasisymmetric (k,l)-hook Schur function* $\mathcal{HQ}_\alpha$ indexed by the composition α is given by

$$\mathcal{HQ}_\alpha(X;Y)=\sum_{F\in HCT(\alpha)}x_1^{v_1}x_2^{v_2}\cdots x_k^{v_k}y_1^{u_1}y_2^{u_2}\cdots y_l^{u_l},$$

where $HCT(\alpha)$ is the set of all hook composition tableaux of shape α, v_i is the number of times the letter i appears in F, and u_i is the number of times the letter i' appears in F.

See Figure 2.3 for an example of a quasisymmetric (k,l)-hook Schur function and the fillings appearing in such a function. Note that $\mathcal{CS}_\alpha(X)=\mathcal{HQ}_\alpha(X;0)$ and $\mathcal{RS}_\alpha(X)=\mathcal{HQ}_\alpha(0;X)$.

3. Properties of the quasisymmetric (k,l)-hook Schur functions

Every Schur function decomposes into a positive sum of quasisymmetric Schur functions [HLMvW11]. Similarly, every Schur function also decomposes into a positive sum of row-strict quasisymmetric Schur

$$\mathcal{HQ}_{(1,2,1)}(x_1,x_2;y_1,y_2)=$$



$$x_1x_2^2y_1+x_1x_2y_1^2+x_1x_2^2y_2+x_1x_2y_1y_2+x_1x_2y_2^2+x_1y_1y_2^2+x_2y_1y_2^2+y_1^2y_2^2$$

FIGURE 2.3. The quasisymmetric $(2,2)$-hook Schur function $\mathcal{HQ}_{(1,2,1)}(x_1,x_2;y_1,y_2)$.

functions [MR14, MN15]. In particular,

$$s_\lambda = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\alpha)=\lambda} \mathcal{CS}_\alpha = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\alpha)=\lambda'} \mathcal{RS}_\alpha$$

The following theorem demonstrates the fact that this behavior continues as expected in the case of quasisymmetric (k,l)-hook Schur functions.

Theorem 3.1. *The (k,l)-hook Schur functions decompose into a positive sum of quasisymmetric (k,l)-hook Schur functions in the following way:*

$$HS_\lambda(X;Y) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\alpha)=\lambda} \mathcal{HQ}_\alpha(X;Y),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\alpha) = \lambda$ indicates that the parts of α rearrange to λ when placed in weakly decreasing order.

Proof. We exhibit a weight-preserving bijection, f, between the set of all semistandard hook tableaux of shape λ and the set of all hook composition tableaux whose shape rearranges to λ. This map is a generalization of the map given in [HLMvW11] between semistandard tableaux and composition tableaux.

Given a semistandard hook tableau T of shape λ, map the entries in the leftmost column of T to the leftmost column of $f(T)$ by placing them in weakly increasing order from bottom to top. Map each remaining set of column entries from T into the corresponding column of $f(T)$ by the following process.

(1) Assume that the entries in the first $j-1$ columns have been inserted into $f(T)$ and begin with the smallest entry, a_1, in the set of entries in the j^{th} column of T.
(2) If a_1 is unprimed, map a_1 to the highest available cell that is immediately to the right of an entry weakly smaller than a_1. If a_1 is primed, map a_1 to the highest available cell that is immediately to the right of an entry strictly smaller than a_1.
(3) Repeat Step 2 with the next smallest entry, noting that a cell is *available* if no entry has already been placed in this cell.
(4) Continue until all entries from this column have been placed, and then repeat with each of the remaining columns.

See Figure 3.1 for an example of this map. We must show that this process produces a hook composition tableau. Suppose $F = f(T)$ for some hook tableau T. The first three conditions are satisfied by construction, so we must check the fourth (triple) condition. For part (a), consider two cells $\hat{F}(i,k+1)$ and $\hat{F}(j,k)$ such that $\hat{F}(i,k+1) \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\hat{F}(i,k+1) \geq \hat{F}(j,k)$. We must show that $\hat{F}(i,k+1) > \hat{F}(j,k+1)$. Let $\hat{F}(j,k) = b$, $\hat{F}(i,k+1) = a$, and $\hat{F}(j,k+1) = c$. Then the cells are situated as shown in Figure 2 with $a \geq b$.

We must prove that $\hat{F}(i,k+1) > \hat{F}(j,k+1)$, or in other words, that $a > c$. Assume, to get a contradiction, that $a < c$. (We know $c \neq a$ since $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and there are no repeated column entries from $\mathcal{A}$.) Since $a < c$, then a would be inserted into its column before c. But then the cell immediately to the right of b would be available during the insertion of a, and therefore a would be placed in that cell since $a \geq b$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Therefore this configuration would not occur and thus $a > c$.

Next, for part (b), consider two cells $\hat{F}(i,k+1)$ and $\hat{F}(j,k)$ such that $\hat{F}(i,k+1) \in \mathcal{A}'$ and $\hat{F}(i,k+1) > \hat{F}(j,k)$. We must show that $\hat{F}(i,k+1) \geq \hat{F}(j,k+1)$. Let $\hat{F}(j,k) = b$, $\hat{F}(i,k+1) = a$, and $\hat{F}(j,k+1) = c$ as before. Then the cells are situated as in Figure 2 with $a > b$.

We must prove that $\hat{F}(j,k+1) \geq \hat{F}(i,k+1)$, or in other words, that $a \geq c$. Assume, to get a contradiction, that $a < c$. Then, as before, a would be inserted into its column before c. But then the cell immediately to the right of b would be available during the insertion of a, and therefore a would be placed in that cell since $a > b$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}'$. Therefore this configuration would not occur and thus $a \geq c$.

The inverse map, f^{-1}, is given by arranging the entries from each column of a hook composition tableau U so that the unprimed entries are strictly increasing from bottom to top, and above them the primed entries are weakly increasing from bottom to top. Since repeated unprimed entries within a column of a



FIGURE 3.1. The bijection f maps a semistandard hook tableau of shape $(4, 4, 3, 1)$ to a hook composition tableau of shape $(3, 4, 1, 4)$.

hook composition tableau would not satisfy the triple rule, the unprimed entries in the diagram $f^{-1}(U)$ must be strictly increasing from bottom to top. We must therefore prove that if two entries, x and y, are in the same row of $f^{-1}(U)$ with x immediately to the left of y, then $x \leq y$ with strict inequality if $x \in \mathcal{A}'$. Argue by contradiction. Assume first that there exists a row in $f^{-1}(U)$ in which x is immediately to the left of y but $x > y$. Choose the leftmost column c in $f^{-1}(U)$ in which such an x exists, and the lowest row r containing this situation with x in column c. Then column c contains only $r-1$ entries which are less than or equal to y while column $c+1$ contains r entries less than or equal to y. Since the column entries in the hook composition tableau U are the same as the column entries in $f^{-1}(U)$, this implies that one of the entries less than or equal to y in column $c+1$ of the hook composition tableau must lie immediately to the right of an entry that is greater than y, which contradicts the definition of a hook composition tableau.

Next assume there exists a row in $f^{-1}(U)$ in which x is immediately to the left of y and $x = y$ but $x = y$ is primed. Again, select the leftmost column c in $f^{-1}(U)$ containing such an x, and the lowest row r containing this situation. Again, the column c contains only $r-1$ entries which are less than y while column $c+1$ contains r entries less than or equal to y. Since the column entries in the hook composition tableau U are the same as the column entries in $f^{-1}(U)$, this implies that one of the entries less than or equal to y in column $c+1$ of the hook composition tableau must lie immediately to the right of an entry that is greater than or equal to y, which contradicts the definition of a hook composition tableau. □

Notice that each hook composition tableau appearing in a given quasisymmetric hook Schur function can be broken into its row-strict portion and its column-strict portion. We may therefore decompose each quasisymmetric hook Schur function into a sum of products of quasisymmetric Schur functions and skew row-strict quasisymmetric Schur functions as follows:

$$\mathcal{HQ}_\alpha(X;Y) = \sum_{\beta \subseteq \alpha} \mathcal{CS}_\beta(X)\mathcal{RS}_{\alpha//\beta}(Y).$$

This is analogous to the decomposition of the hook Schur functions into sums of products of Schur functions and skew Schur functions [BR85] given by

$$HS_\lambda(X;Y) = \sum_{\mu \subseteq \alpha} s_\mu(X) s_{\lambda'/\mu'}(Y).$$

However, some other quasisymmetric analogies of straightforward results about hook Schur functions do not carry through as directly. For example, one can see that

$$HS_\lambda(X;Y) = HS_{\lambda'}(Y;X) \tag{3.1}$$

by taking the transpose of each generating semistandard hook tableau [BR85]. However, taking the transpose of a composition (which rearranges to a partition λ) using the standard method (writing it as a ribbon and then transposing the ribbon and recording the underlying composition) does not produce a composition which rearranges the transpose of the partition λ as seen in Figure 3.2. However, a related result can be obtained once we define a "row-strict" analogue to hook composition tableaux.



FIGURE 3.2. The composition $\alpha = (2,1,3)$ has underlying partition $\lambda = (3,2,1)$. The transpose of α obtained by writing as a ribbon, transposing, and identifying the underlying composition is $\beta = (1,3,1,1)$. The underlying partition of β is $(3,1,1,1) \neq \lambda'$.

Definition 3.2. As before, let $\mathcal{A} = \{1,2,\ldots,k\}$ and $\mathcal{A}' = \{1',2',\ldots,l'\}$ with total ordering $1 < 2 < \cdots < k < 1' < 2' \cdots < l'$ on $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}'$. Given a composition diagram $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_r)$ with largest part m, a *row-strict hook composition tableau* (RHCT), F, is a filling of the cells of α with letters from $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}'$ such that

(1) the entries of F weakly increase in each row when read from left to right,
(2) the unprimed (resp. primed) entries of F strictly (resp. weakly) increase in each row when read from left to right,
(3) the unprimed (resp. primed) entries in the leftmost column of F weakly (resp. strictly) increase when read from bottom to top,
(4) and F satisfies the following *triple rule*:

Supplement F by adding enough cells with infinity-valued entries to the end of each row so that the resulting supplemented tableau, $\hat{F}$, is of rectangular shape $r \times m$. Then for $1 \leq i < j \leq r$, $2 \leq n \leq m$, where $\hat{F}(i,n)$ denotes the entry of $\hat{F}$ that lies in the cell in the i-th row from the bottom and n-th column from the left,

(a) if $\hat{F}(i,n+1) \in \mathcal{A}'$ and $\hat{F}(i,n+1) \geq \hat{F}(j,n)$, then $\hat{F}(i,n+1) > \hat{F}(j,n+1)$, and
(b) if $\hat{F}(i,n+1) \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\hat{F}(i,n+1) > \hat{F}(j,n)$, then $\hat{F}(i,n+1) \geq \hat{F}(j,n+1)$.

Note that this definition switches the role of the primed alphabet with that of the unprimed alphabet. Let $RHCT(\alpha)$ denote the set of row-strict hook composition tableaux of shape α. Then we can define a *row-strict quasisymmetric (k,l)-hook Schur function* as

$$\mathcal{RHQ}_\alpha(X;Y) = \sum_{F \in RHCT(\alpha)} x_1^{v_1} \cdots x_k^{v_k} y_1^{u_1} \cdots y_l^{u_l}$$

where v_i is the number of times i appears in F and u_i is the number of times i' appears in F.

Theorem 3.3. *For $\lambda \vdash n$,*

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\alpha)=\lambda} \mathcal{HQ}_\alpha(X;Y) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\beta)=\lambda'} \mathcal{RHQ}_\beta(X;Y).$$

Before we prove Theorem 3.3, we note that the left hand side is equal to $\mathcal{HS}_\lambda(X;Y)$ by Theorem 3.1. Theorem 3.3 together with Equation 3.1 therefore imply that the right hand side is equal to $\mathcal{HS}_{\lambda'}(Y;X)$. The bijective proof of Theorem 3.3 given below provides a direct method for taking the transpose of a hook composition tableau.

Proof. (of Theorem 3.3) We define a map $\hat{\phi} : HCT(\alpha : \boldsymbol{\lambda}(\alpha) = \lambda) \to RHCT(\beta : \boldsymbol{\lambda}(\beta) = \lambda')$. This map is analogous to the map ϕ in [MR14] taking column-strict composition tableaux to row-strict composition

$$F = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1' & 2' & 3' & \\ \hline 4 & 4 & 1' & 2' \\ \hline 3 & 2' & & \\ \hline 2 & 2 & 3 & 1' \\ \hline 1 & 1 & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} \qquad \hat{\phi}(F) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1' & 2' & & & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 1' \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 4 & 2' & 2' \\ \hline 1 & 3 & 1' & 3' & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

FIGURE 3.3. The result of applying $\hat{\phi}$ to an HCT.

tableaux. Given $F \in HCT(\alpha)$, construct $\hat{\phi}(F)$ by first taking the smallest entry in each column of F and placing the entries in the first column of $\hat{\phi}(F)$ from bottom to top, smallest to largest. Then take the next smallest entry in each column of F and place these entries, smallest to largest, in the highest row of $\hat{\phi}(F)$ satisfying the row increasing conditions (i.e., strict for unprimed entries, weak for primed entries). Continue likewise until all entries have been used. The result of $\hat{\phi}$ can be observed in Fig. 3.3.

To see that $\hat{\phi}(F)$ is a RHCT, note that the row-increasing rules are met by construction, as is the increasing first column. It remains to show that the triple rules are satisfied.

Consider a triple of entries $a = \hat{\phi}(F)(i, k+1), b = \hat{\phi}(F)(j, k)$, and $c = \hat{\phi}(F)(j, k+1)$ with $i < j$, as depicted in Figure 2. First suppose $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $a > b$. Since $a > b$, but a was not placed in cell $(j, k+1)$, c must have been placed prior to a, and thus $a \geq c$. Next, suppose $a \in \mathcal{A}'$ and $a \geq b$. Since $a \geq b$ and was not placed in cell $(j, k+1)$, c must have been placed earlier than a. Thus, $c \leq a$. But, if $c = a$, then in F, c and a were both the $k+1$st smallest entries in their respective columns. But, since F is row-strict in the primed entries, there are no repeated primed entries that are both the $k+1$st smallest entries in their respective columns. Thus, $a > c$ and both triple rules are preserved.

We can define $\hat{\phi}^{-1}$ on an RHCT T by taking the smallest entry in each column of T and placing the entries in the first column of $\hat{\phi}^{-1}(T)$ from bottom to top, smallest to largest. Then take the next smallest entry in each column of T and place them into the second column of $\hat{\phi}^{-1}(T)$, from smallest to largest, in the highest row of $\hat{\phi}^{-1}(T)$ satisfying the row increasing conditions, weakly increasing for unprimed entries and strictly increasing for primed entries. Continue likewise until all entries have been used. The proof that the resulting diagram satisfies the triple conditions is completely analogous to the proof above. □

4. Super fundamental quasisymmetric functions

Both the column-strict and row-strict quasisymmetric functions can be decomposed as sums of *fundamental* quasisymmetric functions as shown in [LMvW13, MN15]. Let $D \subseteq [n-1]$. Then the fundamental quasisymmetric function indexed by D is

$$F_{n,D}(X) = \sum_{\substack{a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \cdots \leq a_n \\ a_i = a_{i+1} \Rightarrow i \notin D}} x_{a_1} x_{a_2} \cdots x_{a_n}.$$

To write $\mathcal{CS}_\alpha$ as a sum of fundamental quasisymmetric functions, we first need to define a standardization map for SSYCT. Given a SSYCT T, we standardize by reading up each column from the left column to the right, replacing the first 1 with 1, the second 1 with 2, etc., then replacing the first 2 with $\alpha_1 + 1$, continuing likewise. The result is $std(T)$, a *standard Young composition tableau* (SYCT); that is, a SSYCT with n cells containing the entries $1, \ldots, n$ each used exactly once. The *descent set* of a SYCT F is $D(F) = \{i : i+1 \text{ is weakly left of } i \text{ in } F\}$. Then, for $\alpha \vDash n$,

$$\mathcal{CS}_\alpha(X) = \sum_{T \in SYCT(\alpha)} F_{n,D(T)}. \tag{4.1}$$

Standardization for SSYRT works similarly. Given a SSYRT T, standardize by reading up each column from right to left, replacing the first 1 with 1, the second with 2, etc., continuing as before with this reading order. The result is $st(T)$, a *standard Young row-strict composition tableau* (SYRT), that is, a SSYRT with n cells containing the entries $1,\dots,n$ each used exactly once. The *descent set* of a SYRT G is $\hat{D}(G) = \{i : i+1$ is strictly right of i in $G\}$. Then, for $\alpha \vDash n$,

$$\mathcal{RS}_\alpha(X) = \sum_{T \in SYRT(\alpha)} F_{n,\hat{D}(T)}. \tag{4.2}$$

In [HHL$^+$05] a *super fundamental quasisymmetric function* is introduced.

$$\tilde{Q}_{n,D}(X,Y) = \sum_{\substack{a_1 \le a_2 \le \cdots \le a_n \\ a_i = a_{i+1} \in \mathcal{A} \Rightarrow i \notin D \\ a_i = a_{i+1} \in \mathcal{A}' \Rightarrow i \in D}} z_{a_1} z_{a_2} \cdots z_{a_n}$$

where $z_a = x_a$ for $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $z_{a'} = y_a$ for $a' \in \mathcal{A}'$. In this section we show that the quasisymmetric (k,l)-hook Schur functions can be decomposed into the super fundamental quasisymmetric functions when the alphabet $\mathcal{A} = 1 < 2 < \ldots < k < \mathcal{A}' = 1' < 2' < \ldots < l'$ and appropriate indexing sets are used as considered in [Kwo09].

We can write the $\tilde{Q}_{n,D}$ in terms of the fundamental quasisymmetric functions. First we define the *composition corresponding to a set* S, denoted $\boldsymbol{\beta}(S)$ (where $S = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k\} \subseteq \{1,\dots,n-1\}$), given by $\boldsymbol{\beta}(S) = (s_1, s_2 - s_1, \dots, s_k - s_{k-1}, n - s_k)$. Note that $\boldsymbol{\beta}(S)$ is a composition of n. Given two compositions $\alpha = (\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_k)$ and $\beta = (\beta_1,\dots,\beta_m)$, the *concatenation* of α and β is given by $\alpha \cdot \beta = (\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_k,\beta_1,\dots,\beta_m)$, while the *almost concatenation* of α and β is given by $\alpha \odot \beta = (\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_{k-1},\alpha_k+\beta_1,\beta_2,\dots,\beta_m)$. In the following, $\overline{D}$ is the set complement of D.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $D \subseteq [n-1]$. Then*

$$\tilde{Q}_{n,D}(X,Y) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} F_{i,D_1}(X) F_{n-i,D_2}(Y) \tag{4.3}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}(D_1) \cdot \boldsymbol{\beta}(\overline{D_2}) = \boldsymbol{\beta}(D)$ if $i \in D$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}(D_1) \odot \boldsymbol{\beta}(\overline{D_2}) = \boldsymbol{\beta}(D)$ if $i \notin D$.

Proof. Each monomial in $\tilde{Q}_{n,D}$ has the form $x_{a_1}x_{a_2}\cdots x_{a_k}y_{b_1}\cdots y_{b_{n-k}}$ where $a_1 \le a_2 \le \cdots \le a_k$, $b_1 \le b_2 \le \cdots \le b_{n-k}$. Note that $x_{a_i} = x_{a_{i+1}}$ implies $i \notin D$ and $y_{b_j} = y_{b_{j+1}}$ implies $j+k \in D$, which occurs when $j+k \notin \overline{D}$. We fix a k and show that the monomials with degree k in the x's are precisely those appearing in $F_{i,D_1}(X)F_{n-i,D_2}(Y)$ for certain pairs of sets D_1, D_2 described below.

Suppose $k \in D$. Then $D = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_i = k, \dots, d_m\} \subseteq [n-1]$. Let $D_1 = \{d_1,\dots,d_{i-1}\} \subseteq [k-1]$ and $D_2 = [n-k-1] \setminus \{d_{i+1}-k,\dots,d_m-k\}$, so $\overline{D_2} = \{d_{i+1}-k,\dots,d_m-k\}$. Then

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}(D) = (d_1, d_2-d_1, \dots, k-d_{i-1}, d_{i+1}-k, \dots, d_m - d_{m-1}, n-d_m),$$

while

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}(D_1) = (d_1, d_2-d_1, \dots, d_{i-1}-d_{i-2}, k-d_{i-1})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\beta}(\overline{D_2}) &= (d_{i+1}-k, (d_{i+2}-k)-(d_{i+1}-k), \dots, n-k-(d_m-k)) \\ &= (d_{i+1}-k, d_{i+2}-d_{i+1}, \dots, d_m-d_{m-1}, n-d_m).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\boldsymbol{\beta}(D) = \boldsymbol{\beta}(D_1)\cdot\boldsymbol{\beta}(\overline{D_2})$.

Now, suppose $k \notin D$. Then $D = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_m\}$ and there is some i such that $d_i < k < d_{i+1}$. Set $D_1 = \{d_1,\dots,d_i\} \subseteq [k-1]$ and $D_2 = [n-k-1] \setminus \{d_{i+1}-k,\dots,d_m-k\}$, so $\overline{D_2} = \{d_{i+1}-k,\dots,d_m-k\}$. Then

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}(D) = (d_1, d_2-d_1, \dots, d_i-d_{i-1}, d_{i+1}-d_i, \dots, d_m-d_{m-1}, n-d_m),$$

$$T = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1' & 2' & 3' & \\ \hline 4 & 4 & 1' & 2' \\ \hline 3 & 2' & & \\ \hline 2 & 2 & 3 & 1' \\ \hline 1 & 1 & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} \qquad stdz(T) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}\hline 12 & 15 & 16 & \\ \hline 8 & 9 & 11 & 13 \\ \hline 6 & 14 & & \\ \hline 4 & 5 & 7 & 10 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 3 & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

$$D(stdz(T)) = \{3, 5, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14\}$$

FIGURE 4.1. Standardization of HCT

while

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}(D_1) = (d_1, d_2 - d_1, \ldots, d_i - d_{i-1}, k - d_i)$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}(\overline{D_2}) = (d_{i+1} - k, d_{i+2} - d_{i+1}, \ldots, d_m - d_{m-1}, n - d_m).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\beta}(D) &= (d_1, d_2 - d_1, \ldots, (k - d_i) + (d_{i+1} - k), \ldots, n - d_m) \\ &= \boldsymbol{\beta}(D_1) \odot \boldsymbol{\beta}(\overline{D_2}).\end{aligned}$$

□

To *standardize* a HCT with content $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_k)$ in the unprimed entries and $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_l)$ in the primed entries, start first with the unprimed entries. Reading up each column, from left to right, replace the first 1 with 1, the second 1 in this reading order with 2, etc., then replace the first 2 with $\alpha_1 + 1$, and continue likewise. In the primed entries, read up each column, right to left, replacing the first $1'$ with $\sum_i a_i + 1$, the second $1'$ with $\sum_i a_i + 2$, etc., then replacing the first $2'$ with $\sum_i a_i + \beta_1 + 1$, and so on. This process can be seen in Fig. 4.1. The *descent set* for a standard composition filling T is $D(T) = \{i \in [n-1] : i+1 \text{ is weakly left of } i\}$. Denote the set of *standard hook composition tableaux* of shape α by $SHCT(\alpha)$ and denote the standardization of an HCT S by $stdz(S)$. Note that these are equivalent to standard composition tableaux and satisfy the triple rules from Definition 2.3.

Theorem 4.2. *For $\alpha \vDash n$,*

$$\mathcal{HQ}_\alpha(X;Y) = \sum_{T \in SHCT(\alpha)} \tilde{Q}_{n,D(T)}(X;Y).$$

Proof. We proceed by showing that the set of monomials in $\mathcal{HQ}_\alpha(X;Y)$ is the same as the set of monomials in $\sum_{T \in SHCT(\alpha)} \tilde{Q}_{n,D(T)}(X;Y)$. First, suppose that $x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_k} y_{b_1} \cdots y_{b_l}$ (where $k + l = n$) is the content monomial associated with a HCT S of shape α with subscripts arranged in weakly increasing order. Let $T = stdz(S)$. To show that the content monomial appears in $\tilde{Q}_{n,D(T)}(X;Y)$, we must show that it satisfies the two conditions: if $a_i = a_{i+1}$ then $i \notin D(T)$ and if $b_i = b_{i+1}$, then $i + k \in D(T)$. Both follow almost immediately from the standardization procedure. First note that if $a_i = a_{i+1}$ then a_i and a_{i+1} are in distinct columns of S since S is column-strict in the unprimed entries. Thus, when standardizing, $i+1$ is placed in a column strictly to the right of i. Thus $i \notin D(T)$. Similarly, if $b_i = b_{i+1}$, then during standardization, $i+k+1$ will appear weakly left of $i + k$ following the rules for standardizing primed entries. Thus, $i + k \in D(T)$. Therefore, $x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_k} y_{b_1} \cdots y_{b_l}$ is in $\tilde{Q}_{n,D(T)}(X;Y)$.

Now, suppose $x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_k} y_{b_1} \cdots y_{b_l}$ is a monomial in $\tilde{Q}_{n,D(T)}(X;Y)$. To find a HCT S of shape α, we reverse the standardization map. That is, replace n by b_l, $n-1$ by b_{l-1}, etc. It remains to show that the result is a hook composition tableau. Note that the condition that $b_i = b_{i+1}$ implies $i + k \in D(T)$ means that, when computing the HCT S, each row will contain distinct primed entries, increasing from left to right. Similarly, the condition that if $a_i = a_{i+1}$ implies $i \notin D(T)$ guarantees that column entries are distinct. Note

that the rows increase weakly by construction. The triple conditions are also satisfied by this reverse map. In T, given the triple configuration in Figure 2, if $T(a) > T(b)$, then $T(a) > T(c)$ since each entry of T is distinct. Then, for the corresponding triple in S, if $S(a) \in \mathcal{A}$, we know that $S(a) \geq S(b)$ and also $S(a) \geq S(c)$ by the reverse standardization map. Since the reverse standardization map preserves the requirement that column entries are distinct among unprimed entries, $S(a) \neq S(c)$, and the first triple condition is satisfied. Similarly, if $S(a) \in \mathcal{A}'$, we know that $S(a) \geq S(b)$ and $S(a) \geq S(c)$ by the reverse standardization map. Thus the second triple condition is satisfied. Thus $x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_k} y_{b_1} \cdots y_{b_l}$ is a monomial in $\mathcal{HQ}_\alpha(X;Y)$. □

5. An insertion algorithm for hook composition tableaux

We give an analogue of the composition tableau insertion algorithm [Mas08] for hook composition tableaux. Note that this algorithm also gives insertion algorithms for column- and row-strict composition tableaux if restricted to just one alphabet.

Given a hook composition tableau F and $x \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}'$, we insert x into F, denoted $F \leftarrow x$, in the following way:

(1) Read down each column of $\hat{F}$, starting from the rightmost column and moving left. This is the *reading order* for $\hat{F}$.
   (a) If $x \in \mathcal{A}$, replace with x the first entry $\hat{F}(i,j)$ such that $\hat{F}(i,j) > x$, $\hat{F}(i,j-1) \leq x$, and $j \neq 1$. We say that "x bumps $\hat{F}(i,j)$". If there is no such entry, then insert x into a new row of length 1 in the first column, in between the unique pair $\hat{F}(i,1)$ and $\hat{F}(i+1,1)$ such that $\hat{F}(i,1) < x < \hat{F}(i+1,1)$. If $x < \hat{F}(1,1)$, insert x in a new cell at the bottom of the leftmost column.
   (b) If $x \in \mathcal{A}'$, bump the first entry $\hat{F}(i,j)$ such that $\hat{F}(i,j) \geq x$, $\hat{F}(i,j-1) < x$, and $j \neq 1$. If there is no such entry, then insert x into a new row of length 1 in the first column, in between the unique pair $\hat{F}(i,1)$ and $\hat{F}(i+1,1)$ such that $\hat{F}(i,1) < x \leq \hat{F}(i+1,1)$. If $x \leq \hat{F}(i,1)$ for all i, insert x in new cell at the bottom of the first column.

(2) If $\hat{F}(i,j) = \infty$ or a new row was created, the insertion terminates. Otherwise, set $x = \hat{F}(i,j)$ and continue to scan cell entries in reading order, starting at the cell immediately following (i,j) in reading order.

(3) Continue likewise until the insertion terminates.

In Figure 5.1 we show the insertion algorithm for several valus of $x \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}'$.



FIGURE 5.1. Row-insertion into a hook composition tableau with bumping paths in bold.

We show that the insertion algorithm yields a hook composition tableau. We also prove that the insertion algorithms for semistandard hook tableaux and hook composition tableaux commute with the function f from Theorem 3.1.

Lemma 5.1. *Let F be a hook composition tableau and let $c_1 = (i_1, j_1)$ and $c_2 = (i_2, j_2)$ be cells in F such that (i_1, j_1) appears before (i_2, j_2) in reading order, $F(c_1) = F(c_2) = a$, and no cell between c_1 and c_2 in reading order has label a. In $F \leftarrow k$, let $(\overline{i_1}', \overline{j_1})$ and $(\overline{i_2}, \overline{j_2})$ be the cells containing the entries $F(c_1)$ and $F(c_2)$ (respectively) after the insertion. Then $(\overline{i_1}, \overline{j_1})$ appears before $(\overline{i_2}, \overline{j_2})$ in reading order and if $a \in \mathcal{A}$ then $\overline{j_1} > \overline{j_2}$.*

Proof. Suppose F is a hook composition tableau, $c_1 = (i_1, j_1)$ and $c_2 = (i_2, j_2)$ with c_1 appearing before c_2 in reading order, $F(c_1) = F(c_2) = a$, and no cell between c_1 and c_2 in reading order has label a. Consider $F \leftarrow k$. Note that if $k > a$, neither $F(c_1)$ nor $F(c_2)$ will be bumped since the sequence of bumped entries is weakly increasing. So, suppose $k \leq a$.

If $a \in \mathcal{A}'$, and $F(c_1)$ is bumped, then either $F(c_1)$ will bump some entry from a cell d between c_1 and c_2 in reading order or $F(c_1)$ bumps $F(c_2)$ by insertion rule (1)(b). Thus $(\overline{i_1}, \overline{j_1})$ occurs prior to $(\overline{i_2}, \overline{j_2})$ in reading order.

If $a \in \mathcal{A}$ it follows that $j_1 > j_2$ since all unprimed entries in a column must be distinct. We must look at several cases.

First, consider $j_1 - j_2 > 1$. Then, if $F(c_1)$ does not bump an entry prior to $F(i_2, j_2 + 1)$, $F(c_1)$ will be inserted in cell $(i_2, j_2 + 1)$ by insertion rule (1)(a). So, in this case, $(\overline{i_1}, \overline{j_1})$ occurs prior to $(\overline{i_2}, \overline{j_2})$.

If $j_2 + 1 = j_1$, then note that $i_2 \leq i_1$ since, if $i_2 > i_1$, then by the triple rule, $F(i_2, j_1) < F(c_1)$, but then row i_2 would not be increasing. If $i_2 = i_1$, then $F(c_1)$ cannot be bumped, though it is possible that $F(c_2)$ could be. If $i_2 < i_1$ and $F(c_1)$ is bumped, then $F(c_1)$ will bump $F(i_2, j_2 + 1)$ or an entry earlier in reading order. In either case, $(\overline{i_1}, \overline{j_1})$ will occur earlier in the reading order than $(\overline{i_2}, \overline{j_2})$ and $\overline{j_1} > \overline{j_2}$. □

Lemma 5.2. *The result of the insertion algorithm is a hook composition tableau.*

Proof. Suppose the sequence of labels bumped during the insertion $F \leftarrow x$ is $x_0 = x, x_1, \ldots, x_m$ with each x_i bumped from cell c_i for $1 \leq i \leq m$. We prove by induction that the result of each bump is a hook composition tableau. Note that conditions (1), (2), and (3) are satisfied by construction. Therefore it suffices to show that all triples continue to satisfy the triple rule throughout the insertion process.

If the insertion algorithm results in a new row being created we need only consider triples of the form

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline x_m & \infty \\ \hline \end{array}\quad, \qquad \begin{array}{|c|}\hline a \\ \hline \end{array}$$

which means that we must show $a < x_m$ if $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $a \leq x_m$ if $a \in \mathcal{A}'$. Suppose that $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $a \geq x_m$. Then it must be that the label x_m was bumped from some cell between c_m and the cell containing a in reading order, else x_m would have bumped a during the insertion process since $a \geq x_m$ and x_m must be greater than the entry in the cell left of a, which we label $\overline{a}$. But, in this case, prior to x_m being bumped from cell c_m, either there was a triple of the form

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline \overline{a} & a \\ \hline \end{array}\quad, \qquad \begin{array}{|c|}\hline x_m \\ \hline \end{array}$$

which violates the condition that F is a HCT, or cell c_m is in the first column of F, which implies $x_m \in \mathcal{A}'$ and hence $x_m > a$. The case with $a \in \mathcal{A}'$ is similar.

Any triple of cells not involving the bumped entry will be unaffected by the insertion, so it is sufficient to consider only those triples involving the bumped entry. Assuming that $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_{j-1}$ have been placed

by the insertion algorithm, consider what occurs when x_j bumps x_{j+1} from cell c_{j+1}. We suppose that $x_j, x_{j+1} \in \mathcal{A}$, noting that the cases where $x_j \in \mathcal{A}$ with $x_{j+1} \in \mathcal{A}'$ and $x_j, x_{j+1} \in \mathcal{A}'$ are similar. When x_j is inserted, bumping x_{j+1} from cell c_{j+1}, we consider three possible locations of the cell c_{j+1} in the triple

b	c

.

a

First we consider when c_{j+1} is in position a. Note that it is impossible for $F(b) \leq x_j < F(c)$ since if this were the case, x_j would have been bumped from a cell above c by the triple rule and hence would end up bumping $F(c)$ instead of x_{j+1}. Thus, the triple condition is satisfied.

Next we consider when x_j bumps x_{j+1} from position b in the triple. We must show that if $x_j \leq F(a)$, then $F(a) > F(c)$, so assume $x_j \leq F(a)$. Note that by Lemma 5.1, x_j cannot be equal to $F(a)$ so in fact we may assume that $x_j < F(a)$. For any cell d, let $\overline{d}$ indicate the cell directly to the left of d. Given cells arranged as in the diagram

$\overline{b}$	b	c

,

$\overline{a}$	a

recall that x_j bumps the entry x_{j+1} from position b. Since the triple condition was satisfied prior to inserting x_j either $x_{j+1} \leq F(a)$ and $F(a) > F(c)$ or $x_{j+1} > F(a)$. If $x_{j+1} \leq F(a)$ and $F(a) > F(c)$, then we are done, so assume $x_{j+1} > F(a)$. Then $x_{j+1} > F(\overline{a})$, since $F(a) \geq F(\overline{a})$. Therefore, by the triple condition, $F(\overline{b}) > F(\overline{a})$. Then, since $x_j \geq F(\overline{b})$ and $F(\overline{b}) > F(\overline{a})$, we have $x_j > F(\overline{a})$. Since $F(\overline{a}) < x_j < F(a)$, if x_j was bumped from a cell earlier in the reading order than a, then x_j would bump $F(a)$ rather than x_{j+1}. Thus x_j must be bumped from a cell between a and b in the reading order. Since $F(\overline{a}) < x_j < F(a)$, x_j could not have been bumped from a cell in the same column and below a or else the triple condition would not have been satisfied. Thus, x_j must have been bumped from the same column as b. However, in this case, since $x_j > F(\overline{a})$, we know that $F(\overline{c_j}) > F(\overline{a})$ since the triple condition was satisfied prior to x_j being bumped from cell c_j, so $x_{j-1} \geq F(\overline{c_j}) > F(\overline{a})$, thus the triple condition is satisfied after x_j is bumped from cell c_j. Similarly, $x_i > F(\overline{a})$ for all $0 \leq i \leq j$ and each of $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_j$ is bumped from the same column. But, since $x_0 > F(\overline{a})$ and $x_0 < F(a)$, x_0 must have bumped $F(a)$ instead of x_1. Therefore $x_j < F(c) < F(a)$ and the triple condition is satisfied.

Finally, if x_j bumps x_{j+1} from position c in the triple, then $F(b) \leq x_j < x_{j+1}$. Thus, since the triple condition was satisfied in F, we know that either $F(a) < F(b)$ or $x_{j+1} < F(a)$. In either case, the triple condition is satisfied after the insertion of x_j. □

Definition 5.3 (Remmel's insertion algorithm [Rem84])**.** To insert x into a semistandard hook tableau T, denoted $T \Leftarrow x$, do the following:

(1) Insert x into the first row by bumping the entry $y = T(i,j)$ with the property that, if $x \in \mathcal{A}$ (resp. $x \in \mathcal{A}'$), $T(i,j-1) \leq x < T(i,j)$ (resp. $T(i,j-1) < x \leq T(i,j)$). If x is greater than every entry in the row, append x in a new cell at the end of the row and the algorithm terminates.
(2) Insert the entry y into the second row, following the same process as before. Continue until the algorithm terminates.

Lemma 5.4. *The insertion procedure $T \Leftarrow x$ commutes with the bijection f from semistandard hook tableaux to hook composition tableaux used in the proof of Theorem 3.1. That is, given a semistandard hook tableau T and $x \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}'$, $f(T \Leftarrow x) = f(T) \leftarrow x$ where $T \Leftarrow x$ is computed using the row-insertion algorithm in Definition 5.3 to insert an entry into a semistandard hook tableau.*

Proof. Consider an arbitrary semistandard hook tableau T and $x \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}'$. We wish to prove that $f(T \Leftarrow x) = f(T) \leftarrow x$. Since f preserves column entries, we need only show that the columns of $f(T) \leftarrow x$ contain



FIGURE 5.2. Only columns i and $i-1$ are shown, where column $i-1$ might contain more entries above y_m.

the same entries as the columns of $T \Leftarrow x$. The column entries of T are the same as the column entries of $f(T)$ by the argument given in the proof of Theorem 3.1. Suppose the insertion sequence for $T \Leftarrow x$ is $x \leq x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \cdots \leq x_m$. (Note that if no bumps occur then $x = x_m$ and $m = 0$ giving an insertion sequence consisting of just x.) Two situations are possible; either the insertion terminates in the same column which contained the first bumped entry or at some point during the insertion of x into T an entry y is bumped from column i to some column j such that $j < i$.

Case 1. The insertion terminates in the same column which contained the first bumped entry. (See Figure 5.2 for an illustration of the situation.)

Let column i be the column in which the insertion terminates. First assume that all elements of the insertion sequence are in $\mathcal{A}$. Then in column $i-1$ of T there are at least $m+1$ entries $y_0, y_1, \ldots, y_m$ such that $x_k \geq y_k \geq y_{k-1} \geq \cdots \geq y_0$ for each k, and $x \geq y_0$. Note that x is less than all entries in column $i+1$ of T (and also $f(T)$) since otherwise x would bump an entry before reaching column i. We also have x is less than all entries in column i of T (and $f(T)$) since x bumps the smallest entry in column i. Since $x \geq y_0$, There is at least one entry in column $i-1$ of T (and therefore $f(T)$) which is less than or equal to x. Therefore x will bump something in column i of $f(T)$ or be placed into column i to terminate the procedure. (Note that it doesn't necessarily bump x_1; we just know that it bumps some entry.)

We need to show that when x_k in column i of $f(T)$ is bumped there exists a location in column i of $f(T)$ such that either x_k can be placed in a new cell at this location or x_k bumps the entry x_j contained in this cell in $f(T)$.

Suppose row p is the highest row of $f(T)$ in which the entry in cell $(i-1, p)$ is less than or equal to x. If cell (i, p) is empty, then x is placed into this cell and the process terminates as desired. Otherwise, x will bump the entry x_k in cell (i, p) and the insertion process continues.

Recall that when $f(T)$ is constructed from T, each entry x_k is placed in the highest available location in column i starting with x_1 and working from smallest to largest. Since for each k there are $k+1$ entries in column $i-1$ which are less than or equal to x_k and $k-1$ entries from column i of T have been placed before placing x_k, there must always be at least one entry in column $i-1$ which is less than or equal to x_k appearing in a lower row that x_k in $f(T)$. Therefore when any x_k is bumped during insertion, there is a valid location for x_k to be placed in column i of $f(T)$.

If at some point during the insertion procedure $T \Leftarrow x$ an entry $x_j \in \mathcal{A}'$ is bumped, then in column $i-1$ of T there are still at least $m+1$ entries $y_0, y_1, \ldots, y_m$ in column $i-1$ of T such that $x_k \geq y_k \geq y_{k-1} \geq \cdots \geq y_0$ for each k but there are also $m-j+1$ entries in column $i-1$ of T such that $x_\ell > y_\ell > y_{k\ell 1} > \cdots > y_j$ for all $\ell \geq j$. The remainder of the argument for the $\mathcal{A}$ case goes through identically. Similarly, if all elements of the insertion sequence are in $\mathcal{A}'$, the statement becomes the following. In column $i-1$ of T there are still

$$T = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}\hline z & b & b & \\ \hline & s & s & y \\ \hline & s & s & \\ \hline \end{array} \qquad T \Leftarrow x = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}\hline y & b & b & \\ \hline & s & s & x_k \\ \hline & s & s & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

FIGURE 5.3. The column containing z in T is column j, the column containing y in T is column i, the entries s must be smaller than y, and the entries b must be bigger than y. Other cells in these columns are omitted, as are other columns.

at least $m+1$ entries $y_0, y_1, \ldots, y_m$ in column $i-1$ of T such that $x_k > y_k > y_{k-1} > \cdots > y_0$ for each k and the proof procedes as above.

Case 2. At some point during the insertion of x into T an entry y is bumped from column i to some column j such that $j < i$. (See Figure 5.3 for an illustration of the situation.)

Assume that $y \in \mathcal{A}$. (We will omit the argument for $y \in \mathcal{A}'$ since the proof is essentially the same; see the proof of case 1 for an indication of how the inequalities change to modify the proof in this situation.) We first establish that during the bumping process on $f(T)$ if y is bumped from column i of $f(T)$ it cannot bump something else in column i of $f(T)$ and must instead scan the next column. To see this, suppose y is in the cell (i,p) of T. Then there are exactly p entries in column $i-1$ of T that are less than or equal to y.

The mapping f from T to $f(T)$ sent y to the highest position in column i such that the entry to its left was less than or equal to y that did not already contain an entry less than y. Since there are exactly p entries in column $i-1$ of $f(T)$ which are less than or equal to y, and y is the p^{th} largest entry in column i of $f(T)$, once y is inserted every entry less than or equal to y in column $i-1$ of T will have an entry less than or equal to y immediately to its right. This means in particular that any entry in column $i-1$ in a row below y that contains an entry less than or equal to y must have an entry to its right that is strictly less than y. Therefore if y is bumped during the insertion procedure $f(T) \leftarrow x$ then it cannot be placed or inserted into column i.

Next we show there is no place between columns i and j for y to either bump another entry or be placed in a new cell. To see this, first note that there are exactly p entries less than or equal to y in T in each column between column j and column i. (If there were more entries less than or equal to y in any of these columns, say column k, y would have been placed in column $k+1$ instead of in column j.)

Thus, when y is bumped from column i during $f(T) \leftarrow x$, there will be no location for y to bump another entry or be placed in a new cell until column j, at which point there is guaranteed to be a valid location for y to be placed or bump another entry.

It remains to show that if y is the entry bumped from column i in T then y is the entry bumped from column i in $f(T)$. Let x_0 be the entry that is first bumped into column i of T during $x \Leftarrow T$. We may inductively assume that x_0 is the entry that is first bumped into column i of $f(T)$ during $x \leftarrow f(T)$. Let $x_0 \leq x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \cdots \leq x_k \leq y$ be the portion of the insertion sequence of $x \Leftarrow T$ contained in column i of T.

If y is not bumped during $x \leftarrow f(T)$, then x_ℓ for some ℓ such that $1 \leq \ell \leq k$ is the largest entry in column i of $f(T)$ that is bumped. (Note that no entry larger than y can be bumped since the entries larger than y are all located immediately to the right of entries larger than y.) Column $i-1$ must contain at least $\ell+1$ entries less than or equal to ℓ, but since x_ℓ is the ℓ^{th} largest entry in column i only $\ell-1$ entries were placed in column i of $f(T)$ during the map from T to $f(T)$, so there must at least one row below the row containing x_ℓ that contains an entry less than or equal to x_ℓ in column $i-1$. Therefore x_ℓ must bump the entry to the right of this entry less than or equal to x_ℓ, and therefore y is indeed bumped from column i during the insertion procedure $x \leftarrow f(T)$. □

6. An analogue of the Robinson-Schensted-Knuth Algorithm

The Robinson-Schensted-Knuth (RSK) Algorithm is a bijection between matrices with non-negative integer entries and pairs of semi-standard Young tableaux. This correspondence utilizes an intermediary step which sends the matrix to a two-line array (a bi-word) satisfying certain properties and can be used to obtain information about the bottom line of this array, such as the length of the longest increasing subsequence in this word. When restricted to permutation matrices, the Robinson-Schensted-Knuth algorithm provides an elegant proof that the number of pairs of standard Young tableaux with n cells is equal to $n!$.

Berele and Remmel [BR85] extend this algorithm to a bijection between members of a certain class of matrices and pairs of semistandard hook tableaux. They use this to prove several important identities for Hook Schur functions including the following analogue of the Cauchy identity:

$$\sum_{\lambda} HS_\lambda(X;S)HS_\lambda(Y;T) = \prod_{i,j}(\frac{1}{1-x_iy_j})\prod_{i,j}(\frac{1}{1-s_it_j})\prod_{i,j}(1+x_it_j)\prod_{i,j}(1+y_is_j). \tag{6.1}$$

We use the insertion procedure described in Section 5 to introduce an analogous bijection between members of a certain class of matrices and pairs of hook composition tableaux. This algorithm can be used to prove a generating function identity for quasisymmetric hook Schur functions.

The following definition describes the class of matrices used by Berele and Remmel [BR85], which is also the class that we use in our variation of the Robinson-Schensted-Knuth algorithm. Intuitively, the blocks in this class of matrices can be thought of as the portions of the diagrams which allow repeated entries (signified by nonnegative integers greater than one) and those portions which do not allow repeated entries.

Definition 6.1. Let M be a $(k_2+l_2)\times(k_1+l_1)$ matrix. Then $M \in \mathcal{M}(k_1,l_1,k_2,l_2)$ if and only if M satisfies the conditions given in the following diagram:

$k_2 \times k_1$ nonnegative integers	$k_2 \times l_1$ 0 or 1
$l_2 \times k_1$ 0 or 1	$l_2 \times l_1$ nonnegative integers

Berele and Remmel give a bijection from this set of matrices to pairs of semistandard hook tableaux to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 6.2. [BR85] *There exists a weight preserving bijection between matrices in the collection $\mathcal{M}(k_1,l_1,k_2,l_2)$ and pairs of semistandard hook tableaux of the same shape.*

The Theorem below provides a bijection from this same set of matrices to a different collection of tableau diagrams; namely to pairs of hook composition tableaux instead of pairs of semistandard hook tableaux. The process is similar to that of Berele and Remmel; the hook composition tableaux diagrams appear because we use the insertion process described in Section 4 rather than the insertion given by Berele and Remmel.

Theorem 6.3. *There exists a weight preserving bijection between matrices in the collection $\mathcal{M}(k_1,l_1,k_2,l_2)$ and pairs of hook composition tableaux with the same underlying partition.*

Proof. Let M be a matrix in $\mathcal{M}(k_1,l_1,k_2,l_2)$. We form a word $M(\omega)$ comprised of biletters $\binom{i}{j}$ following the method of Berele and Remmel [BR85]. Label the columns of M by $1,2,\ldots,k_1,1',2',\ldots,l_1'$ from left to right

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 2 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \longrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 & 1' & 1' & 1' & 2' & 2' & 2' \\ 2 & 1' & 3 & 2' & 2' & 3 & 1' & 1' & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\longrightarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}\hline 2' & & & \\ \hline 1' & 2' & & \\ \hline 1' & & & \\ \hline 2 & 3 & 3 & 1' \\ \hline 1 & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad , \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}\hline 2' & & & \\ \hline 2' & & & \\ \hline 1' & & & \\ \hline 2 & 1' & & \\ \hline 1 & 1 & 1' & 2' \\ \hline \end{array}$$

FIGURE 6.1. Example of the RSK analogue for $M \in \mathcal{M}(k_1, l_1, k_2, l_2)$

and label the rows of M by $1, 2, \ldots, k_2, 1', 2', \ldots, l_2'$. Each entry $M_{i,j}$ of M is associated to a biletter $\binom{p}{q}$ where p is the label of the i^{th} row of M and Q is the label of the j^{th} column of M. The biletters within the word $M(\omega)$ are arranged so that the top elements are weakly increasing (with primed elements considered greater than unprimed elements) and the biletters with equal top elements are arranged according to the following. (See Figure 6.1 for an example.)

(1) The bottom entries appearing under an equal top unprimed entry are weakly increasing.
(2) The bottom entries appearing under an equal top primed entry are weakly decreasing.

We form a pair of hook composition tableaux with the same underlying partition from $M(\omega) = \binom{a_1}{b_1} \cdots \binom{a_n}{b_n}$ by letting $P = \emptyset \leftarrow b_1 \cdots b_n$ and recording the growth of P n the hook composition tableau Q. That is, place a_j into the highest available cell in the k^{th} column of Q where k is the index of the column in which a new cell was created upon inserting b_j into P. The fact that P is a hook composition tableau is immediate from Lemma 5.2. We must check that Q is a hook composition tableau.

To see that Q is indeed a hook composition tableau, recall Berele and Remmel's insertion procedure from Definition 5.3 used to prove Theorem 6.2. This insertion procedure commutes with the insertion procedure used to construct the hook composition tableau P by Lemma 5.4, so the column sets in the recording hook composition tableau Q are the same as the column sets of the recording tableau in the Berele-Remmel construction. Since there is a unique hook composition tableau with each valid collection of column sets, and we know this collection is valid since it can also be obtained from the Berele-Remmel recording tableau. The recording diagram is this hook composition tableau by construction since the entries were placed into the columns in increasing order just as they are in the map from semistandard hook tableaux to hook composition tableaux.

To reverse the process, begin with the highest occurrence of the largest primed entry d of Q. Let L be the length of the row containing this entry. Find the smallest entry e in P such that e appears as the last entry of a row of length L. This value e is the value in P corresponding to d. Reverse the insertion steps to determine the sequence of entries which bumped e and find the initial entry that was inserted into a hook composition tableau P' to obtain P. Place this entry under d in the biword and repeat, building the biword from right to left. □

The following analogue of the Cauchy identity is a corollary to Theorem 6.3 but we prove it using Equation 6.1 and Theorem 3.1.

Corollary 6.4.

$$\sum_{\lambda} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\alpha)=\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\beta)=\lambda} (HQ_\alpha(X;S)HQ_\beta(Y;T)) \\ = \prod_{i,j}(\frac{1}{1-x_iy_j})\prod_{i,j}(\frac{1}{1-s_it_j})\prod_{i,j}(1+x_it_j)\prod_{i,j}(1+y_is_j),$$

where α and β are compositions.

Proof. Recall Equation 6.1:

$$\sum_{\lambda} HS_\lambda(X;S)HS_\lambda(Y;T) \\ = \prod_{i,j}(\frac{1}{1-x_iy_j})\prod_{i,j}(\frac{1}{1-s_it_j})\prod_{i,j}(1+x_it_j)\prod_{i,j}(1+y_is_j),$$

which provides a generating function for products of hook Schur functions. Theorem 3.1 states that:

$$HS_\lambda(X;Y) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\alpha)=\lambda} HQ_\alpha(X;Y);$$

substitute this refinement of the hook Schurs into the generating function identity to obtain

$$\sum_{\lambda} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\alpha)=\lambda} HQ_\alpha(X;Y) \sum_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\beta)=\lambda} HQ_\beta(X;Y) \\ = \prod_{i,j}(\frac{1}{1-x_iy_j})\prod_{i,j}(\frac{1}{1-s_it_j})\prod_{i,j}(1+x_it_j)\prod_{i,j}(1+y_is_j),$$

which reduces to

$$\sum_{\lambda} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\alpha)=\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\beta)=\lambda} (HQ_\alpha(X;S)HQ_\beta(Y;T)) \\ = \prod_{i,j}(\frac{1}{1-x_iy_j})\prod_{i,j}(\frac{1}{1-s_it_j})\prod_{i,j}(1+x_it_j)\prod_{i,j}(1+y_is_j)$$

when the summations are combined. □

7. A Littlewood-Richardson rule

The multiplication of hook Schur functions behaves exactly the same as the multiplication of Schur functions in the sense that the structure constants are the same.

Theorem 7.1 ([Rem84])**.** *If*

$$s_\nu(X)s_\mu(X) = \sum_{\lambda} g^\lambda_{\nu,\mu} s_\lambda(X),$$

then

$$HS_\nu(X;Y)HS_\mu(X;Y) = \sum_{\lambda} g^\lambda_{\nu,\mu} HS_\lambda(X;Y).$$

We prove an analogous result for products of quasisymmetric hook Schur functions and hook Schur functions.



FIGURE 7.1. The empty cells indicate β/α where $\beta = (3,1,5,3,2,4), \alpha = (2,2,1,3)$, and $\gamma = (2,0,2,1,0,3)$.



Type A Type B

FIGURE 7.2. The two types of triples between rows i and j, $i < j$, in a tableau of shape β. When $\beta_i \leq \beta_j$ consider Type A triples. When $\beta_i > \beta_j$ consider Type B triples.

Theorem 7.2. *If*

$$\mathcal{CS}_\alpha(X)s_\mu(X) = \sum_{\beta:\alpha\subseteq\beta} A^\beta_{\alpha\mu}\mathcal{CS}_\beta(X),$$

then

$$\mathcal{HQ}_\alpha(X;Y)HS_\mu(X;Y) = \sum_{\beta:\alpha\subseteq\beta} A^\beta_{\alpha\mu}\mathcal{HQ}_\beta(X;Y). \tag{7.1}$$

In Theorem 7.2 the structure constant $A^\beta_{\alpha\mu}$ is the number of *Littlewood-Richardson composition tableaux* of shape β/α with content μ. Given compositions α, β, a skew composition tableau β/γ is of shape β/α provided there γ is a weak composition (some parts may be zero) with $\gamma \subseteq \beta$ and $\gamma^+ = \alpha$ where γ^+ is γ with all the zero parts removed, as seen in Figure 7.1. A tableau V of shape β/α is a *Littlewood-Richardson composition tableau* when

(1) The cells in α are filled with zeros, as is an additional column, column 0, to the left of the first column of β. Where there are multiple 0's in the same column, we consider the 0's to be increasing from top to bottom.
(2) Each row is weakly increasing from left to right.
(3) A triple of cells in rows i and j, $i < j$, is a *Type A triple* if $\beta_i \leq \beta_j$ with the cells arranged as shown in Figure 7.2, and is a *Type B triple* if $\beta_i > \beta_j$ with the cells arranged as shown in Figure 7.2. All Type A and B triples are *inversion triples*, meaning $c \leq b < a$ or $a < c \leq b$.
(4) The *column reading word* $w_{col}(T)$ obtained by reading down each column of V starting with the rightmost column (omitting all 0's) must be a *lattice word*, a word $w_1 w_2 \dots w_n$ where, for each $i < \ell(\mu)$ and each prefix $w_1 w_2 \dots w_j$ with $j \leq n$ the number of i's in the prefix is weakly greater than the number of $i+1$'s in the prefix.

To prove Theorem 7.2 we define a map $g : HCT(\alpha) \times SSHT(\mu) \to \bigcup_{\beta:\alpha\subseteq\beta}(LR(\beta/\alpha,\mu) \times HCT(\beta))$in the following way:

(1) Given $(U,T) \in HCT(\alpha) \times SSHT(\mu)$, construct the tableau T_μ by filling the Ferrers diagram of μ with the label i in each cell in row i.

$$U = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1' & 2' & 3' & 4' \\ \hline 1' \\ \cline{1-1} 2 & 2 & 3 & 1' \\ \hline 1 & 1 & 1' \\ \cline{1-3}\end{array} \quad , \quad T = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1' \\ \cline{1-1} 1' & 2' \\ \cline{1-2} 2 & 2 & 3 & 1' \\ \hline 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ \cline{1-4}\end{array} \quad , \quad T_\mu = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}\hline 4 \\ \cline{1-1} 3 & 3 \\ \cline{1-2} 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\ \hline 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \cline{1-4}\end{array}$$

$$\to \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 4 \\ 2 & 2 & 1' & 2' & 1 & 1 & 3 & 1' & 1 & 1' & 2 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\to V = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \cline{1-4} 0 \\ \cline{1-1} 1 \\ \cline{1-1} 3 \\ \cline{1-1} 4 \\ \cline{1-1} 2 & 2 & 3 \\ \cline{1-3} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 2 \\ \cline{1-6}\end{array} \quad , \quad S = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1' & 2' & 3' & 4' \\ \cline{1-4} 1' \\ \cline{1-1} 1' \\ \cline{1-1} 1' \\ \cline{1-1} 1' \\ \cline{1-1} 3 & 1' & 2' \\ \cline{1-3} 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 1' \\ \hline 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ \cline{1-6}\end{array}$$

FIGURE 7.3. Example of g

(2) Perform $RSK^{-1}(T, T_\mu)$ to obtain a double word $\binom{\sigma}{\tau}$.
(3) Then $g((U,T)) = (V,S)$ where S is the hook composition tableau obtained by inserting τ into U and V is the of shape β/α obtained by placing 0's in the cells of α and placing each label σ_i from σ into V in the location where a new cell was created by the insertion of τ_i into U.

We claim that V is a Littlewood-Richardson composition tableau of shape β/α and content μ and that g is a bijection. An example of g can be seen in Figure 7.3. Prior to proving this, we first prove some technical lemmas. The first establishes that in the insertion process (step 3 above), once a row i is longer than some row j, $i < j$, then row i remains longer than row j as labels are inserted.

Lemma 7.3. *Let T be a hook composition tableau of shape β. If $\beta_i > \beta_j$ for some $i < j$, then in $T \leftarrow k$, row i is strictly longer than row j.*

Proof. Let T be a hook composition tableau with row i strictly longer than row j for some $i < j$ and let $k \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}'$. First note that if $\beta_i > \beta_j + 1$, then row i will still be strictly longer than row j in $T \leftarrow k$.

Thus we assume $\beta_i = \beta_j + 1$. Then there is a triple of cells in T with labels a, c, ∞

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline a & \infty \\ \hline\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{|c|}\hline c \\ \hline\end{array}$$

with a, ∞ in row j and c in row i. Since this is a valid triple, it must be that $a > c$ if $c \in \mathcal{A}$ (resp. $a \geq c$ if $c \in \mathcal{A}'$). Note that if $k \in \mathcal{A}$ (resp. $k \in \mathcal{A}'$) and $k \geq c$ (resp. $k > c$), then the new cell in $T \leftarrow k$ will be placed in a column strictly to the right of c. This is guaranteed since k (or any label $x \geq k$ bumped during the insertion process) must scan the column directly to the right of c from top to bottom. If k (or x) is not

placed in a new cell earlier, a new cell will be created in row i directly to the right of the cell containing c and thus row i is still strictly longer than row j.

So, we can assume $k < c$ (resp. $k \leq c$) and suppose, to obtain a contradiction, that the new cell in $T \leftarrow k$ is placed at the end of row j with label $d \geq k$. Then the triple of cells under consideration is

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline a & d \\ \hline \end{array}$$

.

$$\begin{array}{|c|}\hline c \\ \hline \end{array}$$

For this triple to be valid, $d > c$ (resp. $d \geq c$) and $k < c < d$ (resp. $k \leq c \leq a < d$). If d was bumped from a column to the right of the cell containing c then either d would have been placed in a new cell to the right of c in row i unless d were bumped from the column directly right of the cell containing c and a row below i. However, this cannot happen because then there would be a triple of the form

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline c & \infty \\ \hline \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{|c|}\hline d \\ \hline \end{array}$$

where $c < d < \infty$ which contradicts the triple rule. Thus, d must have been bumped from the column containing c and a row above row j.

Since $k < c$ but $d > c$ (resp. $d \geq c$), then in the same column as c there must be an entry $f < c$ (resp. $f \leq c$) that bumps some entry g (possibly $g = d$) with $g \geq c$ (resp. $g > c$). Thus, prior to inserting k the triples involving f, g, c are arranged

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline \overline{f} & f \\ \hline \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline \overline{g} & g \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

$$\begin{array}{|c|}\hline c \\ \hline \end{array}$$

For $\overline{g}, g$, and c to form a valid triple we must have $c < \overline{g} \leq g$ (resp. $c \leq \overline{g} < g$). Then, in $T \leftarrow k$, f replaces g, so $c < \overline{g} \leq f$ (resp.$c \leq \overline{g} < f$), but this contradicts $f < c$ (resp. $f \leq c$). Thus, the new cell created in $T \leftarrow k$ cannot be in row j. □

The next lemma provides a convenient way to prove that the column word of a composition tableau T satisfying certain conditions is a lattice word.

Lemma 7.4. *Let T be a tableau of shape β/α and content μ satisfying the type A and B triple conditions. If the word obtained from T by arranging the entries in each column, starting with the rightmost column, in weakly increasing order is a lattice word, then $w_{col}(T)$ is also a lattice word and T is a Littlewood-Richardson composition tableau.*

Proof. Let T be a tableau of shape β/α and content μ satisfying the type A and B triple conditions. Let C_k be the set of nonzero entries in the kth column of T arranged in weakly increasing order. Then $u = C_m C_{m-1} \cdots C_1$ is the word obtained by arranging the entries in each column of T in weakly increasing order. Suppose u is a lattice word. For each i in $w_{col}(T)$ let i_k denote the kth occurrence of i from right to left. Note that for $w_{col}(T)$ to be a lattice word, i_k must appear earlier than $(i+1)_k$ in $w_{col}(T)$ for each i and each k.

Suppose $w_{col}(T)$ is not a lattice word. Then there exist $i, i+1$ such that $(i+1)_k$ appears earlier in $w_{col}(T)$ than i_k for at least one k. Since u is a lattice word, i_k and $(i+1)_k$ must be in the same column of T with i_k appearing in row x and $(i+1)_k$ appearing in row y where $x < y$.

Suppose first that $\beta_x \leq \beta_y$. Then we consider the type A triple



Without loss of generality we consider k maximal among such pairs of $i_k, (i+1)_k$. For this triple to satisfy the triple condition, we must have $a = i+1$. Thus, since each column can have at most one occurrence of each label, $a = (i+1)_{k+1}$. Since k is maximal, i_{k+1} must appear in the same column as a and above a as shown



If the row z containing i_{k+1} has $\beta_z \geq \beta_y$, then $\beta_z \geq \beta_x$ and the type A triple formed by i_{k+1}, b, i_k does not satisfy the triple condition. If $\beta_z < \beta_y$ but $\beta_z \geq \beta_x$, then, as before there is a type A triple violation. Finally, if $\beta_z < \beta_x$, then the type B triple i_{k+1}, c, i_k does not satisfy the triple condition.

Next suppose $\beta_x > \beta_y$. Then we consider the type B triple



Without loss of generality we consider k minimal among such pairs of $i_k, (i+1)_k$. For the triple to satisfy the triple conditions, we must have $c = i_{k-1}$. Then $(i+1)_{k-1}$ must appear in the column below i_{k-1} due to the lattice condition and the minimality of k. Suppose $(i+1)_{k-1}$ appears in row z, $z < x$. Then we have



If $\beta_z > \beta_y$ then $(i+1)_k, b, (i+1)_{k-1}$ violate the triple condition. If $\beta_z \leq \beta_y$ then $(i+1)_k, a, (i+1)_{k-1}$ violate the type A triple condition.

Therefore $w_{col}(T)$ must be a lattice word and hence T is a Littlewood-Richardson composition tableau. $\square$

We are now ready to prove the Littlewood-Richardson rule for quasisymmetric (k,l)-hook Schur functions.

Proof. (*of Theorem 7.2*)

Let $(U,T) \in HCT(\alpha) \times SSHT(\mu)$ and let $g((U,T)) = (V,S)$. Note that the rows of V are weakly increasing since new cells in S are created at the right end of an existing row or in a new row of length one. We now consider the type A and B triples in V. First, suppose there is a type A triple of cells where the entries are a, b, c as in Figure 7.2. Suppose the triple is not an inversion triple, that is, $c \leq a < b$. Then either $c = a = 0$ or a would have been placed before b, contradicting Lemma 7.3. Thus all type A triples in V must be inversion triples. Next, suppose there is a type B triple of cells with the entries a, b, c as in Figure 7.2 and suppose $c < a \leq b$, that is, the triple is not an inversion triple. Then, since $a > 0$, the cells containing c and a are not in column 0 of V. If $a < b$, then the cell containing a must have been added to V prior to the cell containing b since the entries are added in increasing order, contradicting Lemma 7.3. If $a = b$, then a would have be placed to the right of b, contradicting our assumption on the positions of a and b.

By Lemma 5.4 the bijection f and insertion commute. Thus, the column entries of the Littlewood-Richardson tableau L obtained by inserting the entries of τ into $f^{-1}(U)$ while keeping track of created cells by placing the corresponding entries of σ into the Littlewood-Richardson tableau are the same as the entries in each column of V. Note that if we let C_i denote the set of entries in column i of V placed in weakly increasing order, the word $u = C_j C_{j-1} \cdots C_1$ (arranging column entries from the righmost column to the left) is a lattice word since it is the column reading word of L. By Lemma 7.4, $w_{col}(V)$ is a lattice word and V is a Littlewood-Richardson composition tableau.

Given a pair (V,S) where $V \in LR(\beta/\alpha, \mu)$ and $S \in HCT(\beta)$ we compute $g^{-1}((V,S))$ using the following steps:

(1) In V let m denote the largest nonzero label and remove the rightmost cell with label m from V.
(2) In S, remove the corresponding cell by taking the label a in the cell and scanning S in reverse reading order starting from the cell being removed. Then a will *evict* the first entry b such that $a > b$ if $a \in \mathcal{A}$ (resp. $a \geq b$ if $a \in \mathcal{A}'$) and $a \leq c$ (resp. $a < c$) where c is the cell immediately right of b. Continue scanning now with b. The algorithm terminates when all cells prior to the cell containing a in reading order have been scanned. We denote the HCT resulting from the removal of the cell containing a by $a \leftarrow S$.
(3) The final entry evicted from S will be placed into the bottom row of a double word, while m is the corresponding entry in the top row.
(4) Continue removing cells from V one at a time, each time removing a cell containing the largest nonzero label from the rightmost cell with that label. Remove the corresponding cells one at a time from S as before and prepend the results in the double word. Once all nonzero entries in V are deleted, and the empty rows are removed, the remaining cells of S form a composition tableau of shape α that we will call U. We will show that U is a HCT.
(5) Take the resulting double word $\binom{\pi}{\sigma}$ and use the traditional RSK algorithm to insert σ into an (initially) empty tableau while keeping track of cells added with the corresponding labels in π. The result of inserting σ will be called T.

We show that the result of each cell removal in S is a HCT. To do this, note that the only way to take a diagram satisfying the triple rule and remove an entry to create a diagram that doesn't satisfy the triple rule is to remove an entry from position c such that the entry to the left of c is less than or equal to (resp. less than) an entry in a lower row of the column containing c. We must therefore show that if $a < b$ are in the same column, with a at the end of its row and a in a higher row than b that the cell containing a will not be removed prior to the cell containing b. Suppose such a pair $a < b$ exists in S with a in cell (j,k) and b in cell (i,k), $i < j$ with $\beta_i = k$ and $\beta_j = k$. In V let e denote the entry in cell (j,k) and f denote the entry in cell (i,k). Then in order for the cell (j,k) to be removed from S prior to cell (i,k), we have $e > f$.

Since V satisfies all the triple conditions, we know $k > 1$ and the entry of $(j, k-1)$ in V is nonzero. If all the entries in row j are greater than all the entries in row i, then there is a type A triple consisting of the entries in $(j,0),(j,1),(i,1)$. Since the entry in $(j,1)$ is greater than the entry in $(i,1)$ but the entry in $(i,1)$ is greater than the entry in $(j,0)$, there is a violation of the type A triple rules. Suppose now that there is some point in rows j and i where

$\cdots$	g	h	$\cdots$	e

$\cdots$	x	y	$\cdots$	f

with $g < x$ and $h > y$. Then $g < y < h$ which violates the type A triple rule. Thus removing each cell in S according to the above rules results in a valid HCT. The result of removing all cells corresponding to nonzero entries of V results in a HCT of shape α.

It remains to be shown that when Definition 5.3 is used to insert the bottom row of the double word $\binom{\pi}{\sigma}$ from left to right into an empty tableau the result is a semistandard hook tableau and the corresponding entries in the top row are placed into the corresponding cells in a second semistandard tableau with the result being T_μ. This is equivalent to showing that the subwords

$$\begin{pmatrix} i & i & \cdots & i \\ \sigma_{i_1} & \sigma_{i_2} & \cdots & \sigma_{i_{\mu_i}} \end{pmatrix}$$

have the property that $\sigma_{i_j} \leq \sigma_{i_{j+1}}$ for $1 \leq j < \mu_i$ and that $\sigma_{i_{\mu_i}} > \sigma_{(i+1)_1}$ for each i if $\sigma_{i_{\mu_i}} \in \mathcal{A}$ (resp. $\sigma_{i_{\mu_i}} \geq \sigma_{(i+1)_1}$ if $\sigma_{i_{\mu_i}} \in \mathcal{A}'$).

Suppose the cells containing x and y in S correspond to cells containing i in V with x appearing first in column reading order. Then the cell in S containing x will be removed prior to the cell containing y in reading order. Note that the row containing y must be strictly shorter than the row containing x since there is at most one i per column in V and further, if the row containing y has length β_j and the row containing x has length β_m with $m < j$, then $\beta_j < \beta_m - 1$, otherwise the type B triple rule will be violated in V. When the cell containing x is removed from S, a value $c \leq x$ is removed from S and in the new HCT S', the length of the mth row is $\beta_m - 1$. Suppose the entry of cell $(m, \beta_m - 1)$ in S' is d. Then $d \leq x$. If $y \geq x$, then y will evict d when the cell containing y is removed since x has already been removed and there is therefore nothing to the right of y. The process continues and eventually the entry scanning in reverse reading order continuing the removal process is smaller than c or, if e was the label that evicted c from S, eventually the scanning entry g will scan the row containing e and will evict the entry h left of e. Thus $h \leq c$ and the entry removed from S' will be weakly less than c.

To prove $\sigma_{i_{\mu_i}} > \sigma_{i+1_1}$ for each i if $\sigma_{i_{\mu_i}} \in \mathcal{A}$ (resp. $\sigma_{i_{\mu_i}} \geq \sigma_{i+1_1}$ if $\sigma_{i_{\mu_i}} \in \mathcal{A}'$), we first note that the rightmost i must appear before the leftmost $i+1$ in column reading order due to the requirement that $w_{col}(V)$ is a lattice word.

Let S' be the HCT obtained by removing all entries corresponding to entries in V which are greater than $i+1$ as well as all but the leftmost $i+1$. Let v_i and v_{i+1} denote the cells in V containing the rightmost i and the leftmost $i+1$ respectively. Note that in S' there are corresponding cells which we call u_i and u_{i+1} respectively. We denote by x and y the labels in S in cells u_i and u_{i+1} respectively.

We remove y first because y corresponds to $i+1$ and x corresponds to i. Let $y \geq c_1 \geq c_2 \geq \cdots \geq c_k$ be the eviction route for the removal of y and let $d_0 \geq d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \cdots \geq d_m$ be the eviction route for the removal of the entry d_0 in cell u_i of $y \leftarrow S'$. (Note that if $c_j \in \mathcal{A}$ for some j, all inequalities following c_j are strict. Similarly for the bumping path for x.) Since y appears after x in column reading order, the removal of y will scan the cell containing x. Let c_j be the entry in the eviction route which scans x. If x is not evicted and $c_j \in \mathcal{A}$, then $c_j \leq x$. (If x is not evicted and $c_j \in \mathcal{A}'$, then $c_j < x$.) If x is evicted, then $x = c_{j+1}$ and c_j is the entry in cell u_i in $y \leftarrow S'$. Either way, the entry remaining in the cell u_i of $y \leftarrow S'$ is greater than or equal to the entry that scans the next entry during the removal of y. Moreover, if the entry that scans the

next entry during the removal of y is in $\mathcal{A}'$, then the entry remaining in the cell u_i of S' is strictly greater than the entry that scans the next entry during the removal of y.

Assume that the removal of y is complete and consider the removal of the entry d_0 in the cell u_i of $y \leftarrow S'$. Let b be the first entry evicted during this removal and let s_0 be the cell containing b. That means $d_0 > b$ if $d_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ (respectively $d_0 \geq b$ if $d_0 \in \mathcal{A}'$). The entry c_n (where n might be j or $j+1$) which left cell u_i during the removal of y was less than or equal to the entry d_0 (strictly less if $c_n \in \mathcal{A}'$), and hence some entry c_l of the eviction route less than or equal to d_0 (strictly less than d_0 if $c_n \in \mathcal{A}'$) scanned the cell s_0 during the removal of y. Either c_l evicted the entry in s_0 or c_l was weakly smaller (strictly smaller if $c_l \in \mathcal{A}'$) than the entry in s_0. Either way, the entry leaving s_0 during the removal of y was weakly less than (strictly less than if $c_l \in \mathcal{A}'$) the entry remaining there, and hence the entry b is weakly greater (strictly greater if $c_l \in \mathcal{A}'$) than the next entry it sees from the escape route of y. Repeated iteration of this argument shows that the entries in the escape route for x remain weakly greater (and strictly greater if they are in $\mathcal{A}$) than the entries in the escape route for y, meaning the output for removing x is weakly greater (strictly greater if the output is in $\mathcal{A}$) than the output for removing y.

The final step in our proof is to show that our eviction process is in fact the inverse of insertion. This is a two-step process. First we prove that if S' is the result of the insertion $S \leftarrow k$ then applying the eviction process to the new entry created will produce the HCT S. The second step is to prove that if m is removed from an HCT S' via eviction, then inserting the final evicted entry e back into the resulting HCT S via our insertion process produces the HCT S'. We accomplish these two steps by proving that the eviction routes and bumping paths are the same. We use a modified version of the proof that appeared in [AHM16]; the only difference in our approach is our consideration of the double alphabet $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}'$.

Assume first that S' is the result of the insertion $S \leftarrow k$ and apply the removal process to the entry m in the new cell created during this process. We now prove that the bumping path $(c_1, d_1), (c_2, d_2), \ldots, (c_g, d_g)$ for $S \leftarrow k$ is identical to the eviction route $(c'_1, d'_1), (c'_2, d'_2), \ldots, (c'_h, g'_h)$ for the removal of m from S'; that is, $(c'_1, d'_1) = (c_g, d_g), (c'_2, d'_2) = (c_{g-1}, d_{g-1}), \ldots, (c'_h, d'_h) = (c_1, d_1)$. Assume not to obtain a contradiction.

Assume first that (c'_i, d'_i) is the first cell in reverse reading order in the eviction route but not the bumping path. This means that during the insertion of k into S, the entry scanning this cell did not bump $S(c'_i, d'_i)$, but did bump the next entry in the eviction route, $S(c'_{i-1}, d'_{i-1})$. We know that the entry e contained in $S'(c'_{i-1}, d'_{i-1})$ after insertion is the entry scanning $S'(c'_i, d'_i)$ during the removal of m, since the eviction route agrees with the bumping path up to this point (in reverse reading order). Furthermore, the bumping path does not include any cells between (c'_i, d'_i) and (c'_{i-1}, d'_{i-1}) so in fact e is the entry which scanned the cell (c'_i, d'_i) during insertion. Since e evicts $S'(c'_i, d'_i)$ during removal, we have $S'(c'_i, d'_i - 1) \leq e$ if $e \in \mathcal{A}$ (resp. $S'(c'_i, d'_i - 1) < e$ if $e \in \mathcal{A}'$) and $e > S'(c'_i, d'_i)$ if $e \in \mathcal{A}$ (resp. $e \geq S'(c'_i, d'_i)$ if $e \in \mathcal{A}'$). Since the entry in $S'(c'_i, d'_i - 1)$ after removal is the same as the entry in $S(c'_i, d'_i - 1)$ (by equality of bumping path and eviction route up to (c'_i, d'_i)), we have $e \geq S(c'_i, d'_i - 1)$ if $e \in \mathcal{A}$ (resp. $e > S(c'_i, d'_i - 1)$ if $e \in \mathcal{A}'$). Since e does not bump $S(c'_i, d'_i)$, we must have $e \geq S'(c'_i, d'_i)$ if $e \in \mathcal{A}$ (resp. $e > S'(c'_i, d'_i)$ if $e \in \mathcal{A}'$), a contradiction. Therefore if the eviction route and the bumping path differ, their first difference (in reverse reading order) involves a cell which is in the bumping path but not the eviction route.

Assume next that (c_i, d_i) is the first cell in reverse reading order in the bumping path of k, but not in the eviction route of m. Let $e = S(c_i, d_i)$ be the entry bumped during the insertion of k in S. From this we know that $S(c_i, d_i - 1) < e$ since e is bumped during insertion, and $e \leq S(c_i, d_i + 1) = S'(c_i, d_i + 1)$ if $e \in \mathcal{A}$ (resp. $e < S'(c_i, d_i + 1)$ if $e \in \mathcal{A}'$) since e was bumped and at most one entry from each row can be bumped during insertion. Thus, during eviction in S', e is the label that scans cell (c_i, d_i). Since e does not evict $S'(c_i, d_i)$ it must be that either $e \leq S'(c_i, d_i)$ or $e > S'(c_i, d_i + 1)$ if $e \in \mathcal{A}$ (resp. $e < S'(c_i, d_i)$ or $e \geq S'(c_i, d_i + 1)$ if $e \in \mathcal{A}'$). Note that since $S'(c_i, d_i)$ bumped e from cell (c_i, d_i) during the insertion process, $S'(c_i, d_i) < e$ if $e \in \mathcal{A}$ (resp. $S'(c_i, d_i) \leq e$ if $e \in \mathcal{A}'$) and from the preceding discussion, we already know that $S'(c_i, d_i + 1) \leq e$ if $e \in \mathcal{A}$ (resp. $S'(c_i, d_i + 1) < e$ if $e \in \mathcal{A}'$), so e should evict $S'(c_i, d_i)$ and we have a contradiction.

We have shown that there cannot be a position at which the bumping path for $S \leftarrow k$ differs from the eviction route for removing m from S', and hence the bumping path and eviction route must be identical. Therefore $(m \leftarrow S') = S$, as desired.

To go the other way, assume that m is removed from a hook composition tableau S' with final removed entry k to obtain an HCT S, and then k is inserted into S. We will prove that $(S \leftarrow k) = S'$ by showing the eviction route for the removal of m is identical to the bumping path for the insertion of k. This proof is similar to the above argument so we use broader strokes here to provide intuition supplementing the precision in the argument above.

If the eviction route and bumping path are identical then the proof is complete. Therefore we may assume that they differ at some cell. Either this cell is in the eviction route and not the bumping path or this cell is in the bumping path and not the eviction route.

Assume first that (c_i', d_i') is the first cell in reading order that is in the eviction route but not the bumping path. The next entry it evicts is in the bumping path, as are all the remaining entries evicted as the removal comes to a conclusion. Therefore the entry e to scan (c_i', d_i') in S is the entry that was evicted from (c_i', d_i') of S' during removal. This entry e scanning cell (c_i', d_i') during insertion must be smaller than (resp. smaller than or equal to) $S'(c_i', d_i')$ and was situated in this cell before removal; hence it satisfies all conditions necessary to bump this entry, a contradiction.

Assume next that (c_i, d_i) is the first cell in reading order in the bumping path but not the eviction route. Since the bumping path and eviction route agree up to this point, this means that we are bumping an entry which was not evicted, hence the entry e doing this bumping passed by this cell without evicting its entry during removal. But since e bumps the entry in this cell during insertion, we must have e greater than or equal to (resp. greater than) the entry immediately to its left. But then e would have evicted the entry in cell (c_i, d_i) of since e is greater than (resp. greater than or equal to) this entry, a contradiction.

We have shown that there cannot be a first position at which the bumping path for inserting k into S differs from the eviction route for the removal of m from S', and hence the bumping path and eviction route must be identical. Therefore inserting k into S produces S', as desired.

We have shown that when we insert and then remove we get the same bumping and eviction route sequence. We have also shown that if we remove and then insert we get the same bumping path and eviction route. It follows that insertion and eviction are inverses of each other. □

8. Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Jeff Remmel for suggesting this problem.

References

[AHM16] E. Allen and J. Hallam and S. Mason. Dual immaculate quasisymmetric functions expand positively into Young quasisymmetric Schur functions. *arXiv:1606.03519*, (2016).

[BR85] A. Berele and J. B. Remmel. Hook flag characters and their combinatorics. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 35(3):225–245, 1985.

[BR87] A. Berele and A. Regev. Hook Young diagrams with applications to combinatorics and to representations of Lie superalgebras. *Adv. in Math.*, 64(2):118–175, 1987.

[HHL+05] J. Haglund, M. Haiman, N. Loehr, J. B. Remmel, and A. Ulyanov. A combinatorial formula for the character of the diagonal coinvariants. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 126(2):195–232, 2005.

[HLMvW11] J. Haglund, K. Luoto, S. Mason, and S. van Willigenburg. Quasisymmetric Schur functions. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 118(2):463–490, 2011.

[Kwo09] Jae-Hoon Kwon. Crystal graphs for general linear Lie superalgebras and quasi-symmetric functions. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 116(7):1199–1218, 2009.

[LMvW13] K. Luoto, S. Mykytiuk, and S. van Willigenburg. *An introduction to quasisymmetric Schur functions*. Springer Briefs in Mathematics. Springer, New York, 2013. Hopf algebras, quasisymmetric functions, and Young composition tableaux.

[Mac92] I. G. Macdonald. Schur functions: theme and variations. *Séminaire Lotharingien de Combinatoire (Saint-Nabor, 1992), Publ. Inst. Rech. Math. Av*, 498:5–39, 1992.

[Mac95] I. G. Macdonald. *Symmetric functions and Hall polynomials*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. The Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, New York, second edition, 1995. With contributions by A. Zelevinsky, Oxford Science Publications.

[Mas08] S. Mason. A decomposition of Schur functions and an analogue of the Robinson-Schensted-Knuth algorithm. *Séminaire Lotharingien de Combinatoire*, 57(B57e), 2008.

[MN14] S. Mason and E. Niese. Quasisymmetric (k, l)-hook Schur functions. In *26th International Conference on Formal Power Series and Algebraic Combinatorics (FPSAC 2014)*, Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci. Proc., AO. Assoc. Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci., 2014.

[MN15] S. Mason and E. Niese. Skew row-strict quasisymmetric Schur functions. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 42(3):763–791, 2015.

[MR14] S. Mason and J. B. Remmel. Row-strict quasisymmetric Schur functions. *Annals of Combinatorics*, 18(1):127–148, 2014.

[Rem84] J. B. Remmel. The combinatorics of (k, l)-hook Schur functions. In *Combinatorics and algebra (Boulder, Colo., 1983)*, volume 34 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 253–287. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1984.

[Rem87] J. B. Remmel. Permutation statistics and (k, l)-hook Schur functions. *Discrete Mathematics*, 67(3):298, 1987.

[Sch01] I Schur. *Über eine Klasse von Matrizen, die sich einer gegebenen Matrix zuordnen lassen*. PhD thesis, Berlin, 1901.

[vW13] S. van Willigenburg. Noncommutative irreducible characters of the symmetric group and noncommutative schur functions. *J. Comb.*, 4:403–418, 2013.

[Wey39] Hermann Weyl. *The Classical Groups. Their Invariants and Representations*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1939.